

Media Communication
Annual Assessment Report

Department & School:

Communication & Theatre
School of Professional Studies & Social Sciences

2014-15 School Year

Submitted by:

Dr. Alan C. Hueth
Professor of Communication

May 15, 2015

Media Communication Program Mission

The mission of Point Loma Nazarene University states that it exists to provide higher education in a vital Christian community where minds are engaged and challenged, character is modeled and formed, and service becomes an expression of faith. Being of Wesleyan heritage, we aspire to be a learning community where grace is foundational, truth is pursued, and holiness is a way of life.

Similarly, the mission of the media communication program at PLNU exists to reinforce and support this mission:

The purpose of the media communication program is to two-fold. First, we seek to prepare students to become responsible, professional, and creative producers of media programming. This includes programming for broadcast TV, radio, cable TV, film, corporate media, the internet, and church media. Second, we seek to prepare students to be thoughtful and critical consumers of the media. Our goal: to send students into the various secular and Christian media industries to produce outstanding programming and be a witness of Christ's love and grace in the world.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

The PLO's for the media communication major are an extension of the University's learning outcomes (ULOs). The ULOs are listed include:

PLNU Learning Outcome #1: Learning Informed by Faith

Members of the PLNU community will display openness to new knowledge and perspectives, think critically, analytically, and creatively, and communicate effectively. These outcomes are reflected in PLOs #1-3 listed and described below.

PLNU Learning Outcome #2: Growing in a Faith Community

Members of the PLNU community will demonstrate God-inspired development and understanding of others, living gracefully within complex environmental and social contexts. These outcomes are reflected in all of the PLOs listed and described below. The group project orientation of the major requires that students work together harmoniously and gracefully—in all of their production courses and in their internship.

PLNU Learning Outcome #3: Serving in a Context of Faith

Members of the PLNU community will engage in actions that reflect Christian discipleship in a context of communal service and collective responsibility—serving both locally and globally. These outcomes are also reflected in all of the PLOs listed and described below. All/most student projects are aired on PLNU's campus cable channel--*Point TV—Channel 23*—whose mission is to serve the PLNU campus. They do this by creating programs that inform, enrich, enlighten, and celebrate the people and culture of the PLNU community.

PLO #1: Media Literacy Analysis Skills

Media Communication majors will demonstrate their understanding of media literacy knowledge and analytical skills.

PLO #2: Scriptwriting Skills

Media Communication majors will demonstrate scriptwriting skills for radio, TV, film, internet, church media, and/or corporate media industries.

PLO #3: Production Skills

Media Communication majors will demonstrate production skills in radio, TV, film, internet, church media, and/or corporate media industries.

PLO #4: Performance Skills

Media Communication majors will demonstrate performance skills in radio, TV, film, internet, church media, and/or corporate media industries.

PLO #5: Professional Socialization Skills

Media Communication majors will demonstrate professional socialization skills in a radio, TV, film, internet, church media, and/or corporate media industry internship.

Introduction

The methods for assessing each PLO in the 2014-15 school-year are listed below.

The method for assessing learning outcomes for #1 is based on a student-written analysis paper which is described later in this document. The learning outcomes for #2-4 are described below and require the students to create and submit a “reel” (on DVD) which includes samples of their best TV/film/internet production work. Their reel is submitted as a part of a portfolio construction course (COM 422), which is taken in the student’s senior year. The method for assessing learning outcomes for #5 are based on each student’s COM 421 Communication Internship supervisor evaluation.

This year, five (5) students submitted samples of their work for assessment. This represents a 100% participation rate. The student projects consisted of a mix of TV programs including short films, documentaries, interview shows, news, weather, and entertainment stories and performances. This included work in select areas in which they participated as a producer, scriptwriter, or had a role in production or on-camera performance. These projects were viewed (in part or whole) by three (3) local (working) media professionals at a “Portfolio Presentation and Assessment” luncheon on Friday, May 8, 2015, 11:00 a.m.-1:15 p.m., in the C202 classroom on campus.

The media professionals/judges had a combined work experience of 60+ years in the TV and/or film industries. They rated the student's work for learning outcomes 2-4 as "below average," "average," "above-average," or "outstanding"—on the basis of an "entry-level professional beginning work in the different media." The judges were directed to interpret the "entry-level professional..." criterion in the following way:

An entry-level professional means one who would display the baseline skills to get the attention of a prospective employer and gain employment in these different job areas. For a student who directed a short film or ran camera and did lighting--it does not mean that they would, necessarily, be hired on as a director of photography (DP), or director, or actress, etc. for a major, studio-produced motion picture or TV show—based on their present skills. But they would be able to acquire employment at a lower, entry-level position on a motion picture or TV show. For instance, a student who displays strong cinematography and/or lighting skills could be hired as a production assistant or an assistant camera operator or a gaffer--assisting a professional DP—on a professional, independent film. And an "average" to "outstanding" evaluation should be a measurement of the likelihood of this happening—with "average" suggesting an average-possibility, and "outstanding" representing a strong possibility.

The Rating instruments for learning outcomes 2-4 are provided in the appendix of this document. The media literacy papers are kept in a file in Dr. Hueth's office, and the internship supervisor evaluations are kept in a file in the department office.

Means for Assessing Learning Outcomes

Outcome #1: Media Literacy Analysis Skills

Means of Assessment: MC majors write a 10-12 page term paper which displays a knowledge of—and skills in media literacy analysis of a film, TV show, set of commercials, a magazine, website, or some other message/set of messages. The media literacy knowledge and analysis skills include the following dimensions:

1. The cognitive dimension includes the ability to describe factual background information about the message and messenger;
2. The emotional-aesthetic dimension includes ability to describe the artistry of the content and the emotional power of the message; and
3. The emotional-moral dimension includes the ability to describe the artistry of the content and potential effect of the message – especially considering a Christian worldview in the moral-ethical analysis of the message.

The first draft of the 10-12 page term paper is written in the COM 195 Media Literacy course in media communication students' sophomore year, and rewritten in the COM 422 Portfolio Construction course in their senior year. The outcome goal is that all students will display an understanding of media literacy knowledge and analytical skills.

Outcome #2: Scriptwriting Skills

Means of Assessment: MC majors create an audition “reel” of their best scripts which have been produced. These program scripts are produced and aired on the campus cable station (*Point TV-Channel 23*), or on the MC major’s Vimeo page or on YouTube. Some projects are submitted into competitive local, regional, and/or national student TV/film/media festivals. Samples of programs utilizing student’s scripts are presented to working, local, San Diego media professionals, who rate them as below average, average, above-average, or outstanding—on the basis of an “entry-level professional beginning work in the TV or film media.” The outcome goal is that seventy-five (75) percent of students will be rated 2.5 or above in this area.

Outcome #3: Production Skills

Means of Assessment: MC majors create an audition reel which includes complete programs—examples of their best film and television work in which they had a substantial role in production. A substantial role in production includes directing, camera, director of photography (DP which includes camera and lighting), lighting, sound, graphics, set design, and/or editing. These projects air on the campus cable station (*Point TV-Channel 23*) or on the Point TV Vimeo channel. Some projects are occasionally submitted to competitive local, regional, or national student TV/film/media festivals. These samples of student’s production work are presented to working, local, San Diego media professionals, who rate them as below average, average, above-average, or outstanding—on the basis of an entry-level professional beginning work in the different media. The outcome goal is that seventy-five (75) percent of students will be rated 2.5 or above in what they consider to be their area(s) of expertise.

Outcome #4: Performance Skills

Means of Assessment: MC majors create an audition reel which includes complete programs—examples of their best film and television performance work—as an actor, show host, or news reporter/anchor. This also includes serving as on-camera or voice-over talent as a narrator or actor. These projects air on the campus cable station (*Point TV-Channel 23*) or on the Point TV Vimeo channel. Some are occasionally submitted to competitive local, regional, or national student TV/film/media festivals. Samples of student’s performance work are presented to working, local, San Diego media professionals, who rate them as below average, average, above-average, or outstanding—on the basis of an entry-level professional beginning work in the different media. The outcome goal is that seventy-five (75) percent of students will be rated 2.5 or above in this area.

Outcome #5: Professional Socialization Skills

Means of Assessment: All MC and BJ majors are required to complete an internship with a cable, commercial, or public broadcast television or radio station, or film, or other

media production company. Follow-up surveys with student's internship supervisors are accomplished to determine overall preparation and competence in the following areas: attendance, patterns of behaviors, appearance, relationships with fellow workers, communication skills, and more specific job-related skills related to the student's internship assignment.

The average of all interns in a given year will be 4.0 or better on a 5.0 scale of attitude, ability to learn, quality of work, interpersonal relations, maturity/poise, quantity of work and judgment. The average of all interns will be 3.0 or better on the 4.0 scale on dependability and initiative.

Summary of Data Collected & Findings

Preface

SPECIAL NOTE: Although almost all assessment ratings this year represent a decrease in the quality of student work compared to past group assessments, ALL but one student (out of 5) in this graduating group obtained professional employment either before graduation (or one week after) at the following organizations:

One America News (a national news agency)

Dreamworks Television

Pixel Productions (an independent production company in San Diego)

Also, this group's internship supervisor scores were the highest ever of any previous student group

Outcome #1: Media Literacy Analysis Skills

For outcome #1, students submitted a paper which demonstrated their media literacy knowledge and analytical skills. The course instructor evaluated the inclusion of, and explanation/analysis of, the three dimensions of media literacy: the cognitive, emotional-aesthetic, and emotional-moral dimensions. The dimensions are described below:

1. The cognitive dimension includes information about the message and messenger. This includes the following: the title of the message, the medium through which the message was displayed (TV show, film, music recording, print advertisement, commercial, etc.); the writer, producer, and/or director; the main character(s) in the message; when the message was sent/first appeared; if a television show or part of an ad campaign—how long and how many times shown—eg. how many episodes of the particular show, etc.; financial success, including production and marketing budget to create and distribute, amount of money earned (eg. film box office), rating (if TV show), etc.; audience demographic information, and any other background information that is relevant to understanding the message, messenger, and/or context of the message;
2. The emotional-aesthetic dimension includes the artistic aspects of the message and how these aspects elicit an emotion in the student as a viewer/reader/audience. The emotional

criteria is ethos (credibility of the messenger), pathos (pity—including sympathy, empathy, and/or antipathy; and fear—the level of audience engagement or the “what’s going to happen next” effect on the audience). The aesthetic criteria are dependent upon the medium, but generally include the following: the content, theme, and quality of the script, characters and acting, and the visual techniques—including the directing, camera, lighting, sound, and editing—if it’s a film or some type of television program. If it’s a print-based message, the content will include imagery and theme, and any visual components listed above which are relevant to the medium and message. The emotional criteria also include detection and analysis of propaganda tactics evident in the message, including: transfer, slogans, testimonial, plain folks, name calling, card stacking, bandwagon, glittering generalities, and music (if a film or television program).

3. The emotional-moral-ethical dimension deals with the content and its potential positive and/or negative effect upon individuals and the general public. It includes an identification of relevant effects theories related to potential effects. The framework for the ethical analysis is based on the Potter Box Model of normative ethical decision-making, and includes the following: a framing-definition of the ethical dilemma/situation, and who’s involved, and the question or problem at hand; an explanation of the relevant values involved in this dilemma; relevant ethical principles, including: Mills’ and Bentham’s “utilitarian ethics,” Kant’s “categorical imperative,” Aristotle’s “golden mean,” Rawls’ “veil of ignorance,” and, especially, the Judeo-Christian “persons as ends”/agape love principle and relevant scripture—all to determine a position/decision taken about the ethics/morality of the message through the lens of a biblical-Christian worldview.

This first year of this learning outcomes assessment, five (5) students submitted a 2nd draft of the paper in the COM 422 Portfolio Construction course. Each section of every paper and the video submission were reviewed to determine if the student displayed knowledge of each of the three media literacy dimensions.

Summary of the findings: all student papers displayed evidence of media literacy knowledge and analytical skills in the three dimensions of media literacy analysis.

Outcome #2: Scriptwriting Skills

For learning outcome #2, students presented their audition reels to three (3) assessors-media professionals. They rated the student’s work on a four point scale as below average (1), average (2), above-average (3), or outstanding (4)—on the basis of “*an entry-level professional*” beginning work in the different media.

A summary of the media professional’s ratings for outcomes #2-4 are provided below.

Evaluating student’s scriptwriting skills for TV/Film (drama/comedy) included the consideration of a script’s creative conceptual approach (CCA), creative visualization (CV), and the quality of the narration/dialogue (N/D), along with story structure (Structure), and clarity (clarity). Judges

ratings for TV/film scriptwriting, radio scriptwriting, and TV news scriptwriting are provided below:

Four (4) of the five (5) students submitted scriptwriting samples. The mean scores for the four students were: 2.2, 2.4, 2.3, and 2.1. These outcomes represent a 0% success rate for reaching the 2.5 (or above) target goal.

The chart below includes the individual student averages in each area of scriptwriting—with the previous year’s 2013-14 outcomes in parentheses.

CCA	CV	N/D	S	C
2.4	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.1
(2.7)	(2.2)	(2.5)	(2.4)	(2.1)

There was a .3 decrease only in the CCA category. However, creative visualization, structure, and clarity were the same from last year, and there was a .3 increase in narration/dialogue.

The lack of meeting the target goal can be attributed to several things:

1. Student disinterest in scriptwriting. This is evident by mostly average student grades in the one scriptwriting class that is offered, and/or shying away from the scriptwriting role in courses where they are writing and getting practice in writing scripts for television and film projects; and
2. English not being their first language but their second language—this was the case with one student

Outcome #3: Production Skills

Evaluating student’s production skills for TV/film and TV news production included the consideration of producing (P), camera (C), sound (S), lighting (L), set design (SD), graphics (G), directing (D), and/or editing (E).

All five (5) students submitted work for evaluation of production skills. Two (2) of the five (5) students who submitted production work exceeded the 2.5 or above outcome goal. The cumulative mean scores for all categories of production for the five (5) students were: 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, and 2.2. These outcomes equate to a 40% success rate for reaching the 2.5 (or above) target score.

Below are the cumulative student averages in each category of production. Averages from the previous year are in parentheses.

P:	C:	S:	L:	Set:	G:	D:	E:
2.7	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.5	2.1	2.5	2.3
(No subs)	(2.5)	(3.0)	(2.7)	(2.4)	(2.3)	(2.7)	(2.6)

There were decreases in all categories except for a +.1 increase in set-design (Seg). This can be attributed to the fact that four (4) of the five (5) students' strengths and orientation to television and film was the producer role. Therefore, they didn't have near as much hands-on practice in production that is normally the case in past, more typical groups.

Outcome #4: Performance Skills

Evaluating student's performance skills for TV/film included the consideration of appropriate appearance (AA), energy/animation (E&A), movement (M), articulation (A), and pacing and rhythm (P&R).

Four (4) students submitted work for on-camera or off-camera performance. Two (2) of the four (4) students who submitted work for evaluation exceeded the target goal of a 2.5 minimal mean score for performance. The mean scores for the students were 2.5, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5. That's a 50% success rate—which is below the 75% target rate.

The cumulative mean scores for each performance category for all students are listed below—with the previous year's scores in parentheses.

AA	E&A	M	A	P&R
2.4 (2.8)	2.7 (2.3)	2.3 (2.7)	2.3 (3.0)	2.2 (2.7)

There was a decrease from the previous year in all categories except for energy and enthusiasm (E&A)—with an overall .4 decrease. These decreases can be attributed to the following:

1. None of the students are performance concentration majors—they're all production concentration majors. Therefore, they have not taken any performance-oriented courses;
2. There was a larger than normal range of scoring from the individual judges on the same projects. For instance, the three judges mean scores for two student projects that were submitted were 2.8, 2.8, and 1.4. The 1.4 judge's evaluation was a full -1.4 deviation from the other two judges. Another project's range of averages was 2.2, 3.4, and 2.4. this represents a -1.2 deviation from lowest to highest score.

- Also, there was a very uneven amount of on-camera experience with these four (4) students. Some had substantially more experience than others--which negatively-affected the students with lower scores.

Outcome #5: Professional Socialization Skills

The data for this outcome was provided through internship supervisor evaluations.

On the internship evaluations that were available, the supervisors were asked to do the following:

“Evaluate the intern with other students of comparable academic level, with other personnel assigned the same or similarly classified duties, or with individual standards. Remarks are particularly helpful. Check one item in each section that best describes the intern.”

The internship evaluation included the following aptitudes for the supervisors to respond to: attitude, dependability, quality of work, maturity/poise, judgment, ability to learn, initiative, relations/others, and quantity of work. Students were rated on a 1-5 scale, with 5 being outstanding, 4-above-average, 3-average, 2-below average, and 1-poor. They also included recurring examples of comments fairly-typical for PLNU students. All five (5) had consistently outstanding scores on most categories. Ninety-nine point five (99.5) percent of the scores were rated “above-average” to “outstanding” in every category for this group. Only two (2) students had one average score, and both of these were for amount of work completed. The cumulative averages of the students in each category is provided below—with the previous year’s scores in parentheses.

Attitude	23/5	(4.6) 4.8
Dependability	22/5	(4.4) 5.0
Quality of Work	24/5	(4.8) 4.8
Maturity/Poise	23/5	(4.6) 5.0
Judgment	22/5	(4.4) 4.8
Ability to learn	24/5	(4.8) 4.8
Initiative	20/5	(4) 4.6
Relations/Others	23/5	(4.6) 4.6
Quantity of Work	21/5	(4.2) 4.2
Average Total		4.73 (4.48)

The internship supervisors also included comments in the different areas:

Attitude:

Very enthusiastic

Works very hard and cares a lot about the work that he is doing

Dependability:

Usually to Completely Dependable

Quality of Work:

Excellent to above-average!

Maturity/Poise:

Very poised and confident

Judgment:

Most are rated *Exceptionally mature in judgment*

Ability to Learn:

Most *Learned work readily to Exceptionally-well*

Initiative:

Proceeds well on his/her own

Goes ahead independently at times

Relations with Others:

Most rated *Exceptionally well-accepted*

“Team player and terrific attitude!”

Quantity of Work:

Mostly Usually high output, with a couple Normal and More than average

Attendance:

Outstanding to above-average on all of these criteria.

Punctuality

All Regular

The supervisor remarks continue to be overwhelmingly positive. These findings reveal that the outcome goals have been surpassed.

Use of Results

For Outcome #1—Media Literacy Knowledge and Analysis Skills: this second year of a 100% success rate for this learning outcome suggests that changes should be considered. This could include broadening, deepening and, perhaps, increasing the level of rigor for each dimension of media literacy analysis. This will involve the creation of a more detailed and specific rubric for each dimension of media literacy—based on the particular criteria for each type of media message. This will be explored more deeply in the COM 195 Media Literacy and the COM 422 Portfolio Construction courses.

For Outcome #2-Scriptwriting: the decrease in the writing scores is partly-attributable to student disinterest in scriptwriting in this particular group, and the fact that English was one student's second language. Also, most of the writing samples were either for short films or news-oriented projects. Short film scripts are the most difficult kinds of scripts to write. And the news-oriented work is generally more foreign to media communication majors and, therefore, MC majors have less experience writing these kinds of scripts. Finally, these scores continue to support one of the glaring weaknesses of our curriculum: we have only one (1) scriptwriting course—and that course is an overview of all forms of scriptwriting for television, film, and new media. This is a strong indicator for the need of an advanced scriptwriting course that focuses on drama and comedy writing for film and television.

For outcome #3-Production: the 40% success rate on production is below the target score. This can be attributed to this group's more focused interest in the producing role—with an accompanying lack of production experience in most of the different production categories. Also, a more careful and selective sample of student work that is shown— focused only on their best work -- would skew the averages up. In any case, we will continue to emphasize the importance of mastering the fundamentals of production in all of our production courses.

Four outcome #4-Performance: the outcomes were below the program goal. However, these scores can be attributed to the fact that there were no performance concentration students graduating this year. Therefore, they had less interest and practice in performance techniques—through less courses and less experience in their projects. However, we will include some increased time on the techniques of performance through additional performance instruction in the COM 425 TV Workshop course. And, we will continue to emphasize the importance of mastering the fundamentals of performance in all production courses.

For outcome #5-Professional Socialization Skills: our students continue to excel and impress professional media organizations. We will continue to emphasize the importance of not only the technical and creative skills in our curriculum, but also the “soft skills.”

As with any research project, this assessment research has its limitations. The assessment is highly-dependent on student selection of their best work. Some students were successful in including their best work, while others were less successful. Also, it is important that faculty select and show students' best work in each particular area—rather than most/all of their work in each area. More emphasis and instructions will be conveyed to students about saving all of their past projects to assure that they are truly-including their best work. Also, more emphasis will be placed on instructor selection of students' work shown at the assessment luncheon. These two factors (student selection of their work, and instructor selection of what is shown at the assessment luncheon) can affect the scores.

Finally, there is evidence that we need to review and, perhaps, editing the evaluation instrument. There is a question about the 2.5 average as an acceptable goal. The original assumption for using this number was that 2.5 would be a mid-range “average” (or “true” average) score. However, for the student to get to the 2.5 average in a category on the present instrument, some

judges must rate the student's skill at the 3.0 (or above-average level). Therefore, to clarify and simplify the judges evaluations, next year's evaluation instruments will be using a five-point scale—with the number three (3) being the true average:

5 = outstanding

4 = above average

3 = average

2 = below average

1 = poor

Given this change, starting next year (2015-16), the program goal will be that 75% of students will have a 3.0 (or higher) rating for an entry-level professional position in the media.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Assessment:
Scriptwriting

Student Name: _____ Program Title: _____ Judge #: _____

Please evaluate the following areas in which this student was involved in the project you are about to see. Your evaluation should be based on a comparison to **entry-level professional standards** of quality in video/film scriptwriting.

Creative Conceptual Approach

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Creative Visualization

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Narration/Dialogue

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Story Structure

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Story Clarity

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Other comments:

Assessment:
TV/Film Production

Student Name: _____ Program Title: _____ Judge #: _____

Please evaluate the following areas in which this student was involved in the project you are about to see. Your evaluation should be based on a comparison to **entry-level professional standards** of quality in video/film production.

Producer:

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Camera Operation & Technique:

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Sound

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Lighting

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Set Design

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Graphics

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Directing

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Editing

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Assessment:

TV/Film Performance

Student Name: _____ Program Title: _____ Judge #: _____

Please evaluate the following areas in which this student was involved in the project you are about to see. Your evaluation should be based on a comparison to **entry-level professional standards** of quality in TV/film performance.

Appropriate Appearance

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Energy/Animation

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Movement

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Articulation

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Pacing & Rhythm

_____ 1 Below-Average

_____ 2 Average

_____ 3 Above-Average

_____ 4 Outstanding

Comments:

Other comments: